

## Document Log Item

Addressing	
<b>From</b>	<b>To</b>
James Chang/R9/USEPA/US	david.green@afropa.pentagon.af.mil David Green
<b>CC</b>	<b>BCC</b>
cox_calvin@bah.com Gilbert.Dimidjian@us.mwhglobal.com Susan@sologeo.com Jehiel Cass <jcass@rb6v.swrcb.ca.gov> John Hamill/R9/USEPA/US@EPA Taly Jolish/R9/USEPA/US@EPA	BMabey@TechLawInc.com
<b>Description</b> Form Used: Memo	
<b>Subject</b>	<b>Date/Time</b>
Housing FOST comments	07/26/2007 03:47 PM
<b># of Attachments</b>	<b>Total Bytes</b>
0	3,667
<b>NPM</b>	<b>Contributor</b>
<b>Processing</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	

Body

### Document Body

Dave,  
Following are EPA's subject comments:.

1. Section 4, pg 3. The FOST identifies the property as an ECC 1, but ECC 7 is more appropriate because the dieldrin contaminated soil require additional evaluation. EPA believes that the contaminated soil poses a potential risk to human health and the environment, and that the AF should conduct an adequate evaluation to address that risk.

2. Section 5.15, pg 12. The text states that "the Dieldrin present in soil and groundwater is not considered a CERCLA release under Section 103...." Section 103 does not define the term "release." The proper application of a pesticide IS a release, per the definition in Section 101(22), and needs to be evaluated as such. Section 103 sets forth those circumstances which require notice to the agency, and does nothing more than exclude certain pesticide applications from the notice requirement.

3. EPA concurs with the proposed restrictions in Section 5.15. The text should also state that the AF will provide EPA with a draft deed for review before it is recorded, and that the transferred property will be covered by a SLUC to make the restrictions enforceable by the State.

Please call me if you have questions, thanks.

\*\*\*\*\*

James Chang

Phone: 415.972.3193 Fax: 415.947.3526